

PTO/SB/17i (11-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2007. OMB 0651-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**PROCESSING FEE****Under 37 CFR 1.17(i)****TRANSMITTAL**

(Fees are subject to annual revision)

Send completed form to: Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Application Number	09/783,250
Filing Date	02/14/2001
First Named Inventor	Kallol Pal
Art Unit	2192
Examiner Name	Chuck O. Kendall
Attorney Docket Number	JP920000411U51

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****MAR 06 2007**Enclosed is a paper filed under 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2) that requires a processing fee (37 CFR 1.17(i)).  
Payment of \$ 500.00 is enclosed.

This form should be included with the above-mentioned paper and faxed or mailed to the Office using the appropriate Mail Stop, if applicable. For transmittal of petition fees under 37 CFR 1.17(f), (g) or (h), see form PTO/SB/17p.

**Payment of Fees** (small entity amounts are NOT available for the petition fees)

09-0457

☒ The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the following fees to Deposit Account No. \_\_\_\_\_:☒ processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(i) ☒ any deficiency of fees and credit of any overpayments

Enclose a duplicative copy of this form for fee processing.

☐ Check in the amount of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ is enclosed.☐ Payment by credit card (Form PTO-2038 or equivalent enclosed). Do not provide credit card information on this form.**Processing Fees under 37 CFR 1.17(i): Fee \$130 Fee Code 1808 for all,  
Except for § 1.221 papers (Fee Code 1803)**

For papers filed under:

- § 1.28(c)(3) - for processing a non-itemized fee deficiency based on an error in small entity status.
- § 1.41 - for supplying the name or names of the inventor or inventors after the filing date without an oath or declaration as prescribed by § 1.63, except in provisional applications.
- § 1.48 - for correcting inventorship, except in provisional applications.
- § 1.52(d) - for processing a nonprovisional application filed with a specification in a language other than English.
- § 1.53(b)(3) - to convert a provisional application filed under § 1.53(c) into a nonprovisional application under § 1.53(b).
- § 1.56 - for entry of late priority papers.
- § 1.99(a) - for processing a belated submission under § 1.99.
- § 1.103(b) - for requesting limited suspension of action, continued prosecution application (§ 1.53(d)).
- § 1.103(c) - for requesting limited suspension of action, request for continued examination (§ 1.114).
- § 1.103(d) - for requesting deferred examination of an application.
- § 1.217 - for processing a redacted copy of a paper submitted in the file of an application in which a redacted copy was submitted for the patent application publication.
- § 1.221 - for requesting voluntary publication or republication of an application. **Fee Code 1803**
- § 1.291(c)(5) - for processing a second or subsequent protest by the same real party in interest.
- § 1.497(d) - for filing an oath or declaration pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 371(c)(4) naming an inventive entity different from the inventive entity set forth in the international stage.
- § 3.81 - for a patent to issue to assignee, assignment submitted after payment of the issue fee.

*Anthony V S England*

Signature

Anthony V.S. England

Typed or printed name

3-6-2007

Date

35,129

Registration No., if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.17. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 5 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

MAR 06 2007

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006, OMB 0851-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

<b>TRANSMITTAL FORM</b>  (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	09/783,280	
	Filing Date	02/14/2001	
	First Named Inventor	Kallol Pal	
	Art Unit	2192	
	Examiner Name	Chuck O. Kendall	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	30	Attorney Docket Number	JP920000411U51

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation <input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
Remarks		

## SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name	Law Office of Anthony England		
Signature	<i>Anthony V.S. England</i>		
Printed name	Anthony V.S. England		
Date	3-6-2007	Reg. No.	35,129

## CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:			
Signature	<i>Anthony V.S. England</i>		
Typed or printed name	Anthony V.S. England	Date	3-6-2007

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001**In the United States Patent and Trademark Office****RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

MAR 06 2007

In re the application of: Kallol Pal	)	
	)	
Filed 02/14/2001	)	Group Art Unit: 2192
	)	
For: Software Testing	)	Examiner: Chuck O. Kendall
	)	
Appl. No.: 09/783,250	)	
	)	
Appellant's Docket:	)	
JP920000411US1	)	

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**APPEAL BRIEF****REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The assignee, International Business Machines Corporation, is the real party in interest.

**RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

This is the third appeal in the present patent application. There are no other appeals or interferences known to the appellant or its legal representative. International Business Machines Corporation is the sole assignee of the patent application.

03/08/2007 AWONDAF1 00000035 090457 09783250  
01 FC:1402 500.00 DA

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001**STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 3, 5-17, 20, 22-30, 33, and 35-45 are pending in the application. (Claims 1-45 were originally submitted. Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 18, 19, 21, 31, 32, and 34 were subsequently canceled.) All the pending claims stand rejected. Office action of October 6, 2006, (the "Current Office Action").

More specifically, in a fifth Office action, dated December 30, 2005, claims 3, 5, 6, 9, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, 23, 25 and 29 were finally rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,067,639 (Darty), in view of Telcordia Software Visualization and Analysis Toolsuite User's Manual, Chapter 3, ATAC: Overview (ATAC). Claims 10-12, 14, 17, 26-28 and 30 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty, in view of ATAC, and further in view of U.S. patent 6,067, 639 (Rodrigues). Claims 7, 8 and 24 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty, in view of ATAC, and further in view of U.S. patent 5,860,009 (Uchihira). Claims 33, 35-38, 40-43 and 45 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty, in view of ATAC, and further in view of U.S. patent 6,397,378 B1 (Grey). Claims 39 and 44 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty, in view of ATAC, Grey, and Rodrigues.

Appellant responsively filed a second Notice of Appeal on April 4, 2006, and then an Appeal Brief on June 5, 2006. In turn, a sixth Office action of October 6, 2006, which was non-final, reopened prosecution for a second time. In the sixth Office action, the ATAC reference was withdrawn and a new reference, U.S. patent 5,729,676 (Inoue) was asserted in its place.

Thus, Claims 3, 5, 6, 9, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, 23, 25 and 29 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty, in view of Inoue. Claims 10-12, 14, 17, 26-28 and 30 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty, in view of Inoue, and further in view of Rodrigues. Claims 7, 8 and 24 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty, in view of Inoue, and further in view of Uchihira. Claims 33, 35-45, and 45 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty, in view of Inoue, and further in view of Grey. Claim 44 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty, in view of Inoue, and further in view of Grey, and further in view of Rodrigues.

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001

Appellant has appealed the rejections of the sixth Office action. Notice of Appeal, filed January 7, 2007. The claims appealed herein, and for which arguments are herein presented, are claims 13, 29 and 42. (Arguments are *not* herein presented regarding claims 3, 5-12, 14-17, 20, 22-28, 30, 33, 35-41, and 43-45. However, appellant contends, of course, that these claims are allowable since they depend on claims for which arguments are herein presented and which appellant contends are allowable.)

### **STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

There are no amendments in connection with this appeal and none were submitted subsequent to the Current office action. The claims in the Claim Appendix herein set out the claims as amended in appellant's reply of October 7, 2005, which was prior to the Current office action.

### **SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

The present invention is claimed in the form of a method, a computer program product and a system in independent claims 13, 29, and 42, respectively.

#### **Claim 13**

Claim 13 points out that a method of testing a program includes step a), according to which the program is divided into groups such that every statement in the program belongs to at least one of the groups. See present application page 18, lines 1-2, 8-15, and FIG's 4A - 4C (showing all statements in the program of FIG. 4A, i.e., lines 3, 5, 6, 8 - 18, 20 - 25, 27 and 28, divided into respective groups B11 - B18 in FIG's 4B and 4C, wherein group B11 in FIG. 4B includes lines corresponding to lines 3, 5 and 6 of FIG. 4A, group B12 includes lines corresponding to lines 8 and 9 of FIG. 4A, group B13 in FIG. 4B includes a line corresponding to line 10 of FIG. 4A, group B14 in FIG's 4B and 4C includes lines corresponding to lines 11 - 13 of FIG. 4A, group B15 in FIG. 4C includes lines corresponding to lines 14 - 15 of FIG. 4A, group B16 in FIG. 4C includes lines corresponding to lines 16 - 18 of FIG. 4A, group B17 in FIG. 4C includes lines corresponding to lines 20 - 21 of FIG. 4A, and group B18 in FIG. 4C includes lines corresponding to lines 22 - 25, 27 and 28 of FIG. 4A).

Claim 13 goes on to state that each of the groups contains a respective sequence of ones of the statements such that all the statements of such a group are executed if at least one

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001

statement of said group is executed. See present application page 8, line 19-page 9, line 2. Also see page 18, lines 2-6, and FIG's 4A - 4C (showing sequences such as the statement of line 10 of FIG. 4A for group B13 (a sequence of one statement) and the statements of lines 11 - 13 of FIG. 4A for group B14, etc.).

Claim 13 goes on to state in that such a group is deemed to be executed if at least one of the statements of the group is executed when the program is executed. See present application page 18 and FIG's 4A - 4C (showing groups of statements in which none of the groups have any branching statements, except at the end of the group, that would cause some of the statements in the group to not be executed along with the others in the group).

Claim 13 goes on to set out step b), according to which there is a determining of the ones of the groups that are executed when said program is executed while testing said program. See present application page 13, lines 10-12, and FIG. 2.

In step c) Claim 13 states unexecuted ones of the groups are indicated based on the ones of the groups that were determined in step b) to have been executed. See present application page 14, lines 1-7, and FIG. 2.

In step d), claim 13 states a tester is enabled to execute said unexecuted groups such that said tester can ensure that all statements in said program are executed at least once. See present application page 14, lines 8-11, and FIG. 2.

Step e) of Claim 13 states that step d) includes an extra statement in each of said groups, wherein execution of such an extra statement enables said determining in step b) to identify an executed one of the groups corresponding to said extra statement, wherein said program is contained in a plurality of programs which in turn are contained in a class of an object oriented environment. See present application page 4, lines 2-9. See also page 15, lines 9-12, and FIG. 3.

In step f), claim 13 states that the tester is enabled to define a macro containing a plurality of program lines storing said macro in a database. See present application page 9, lines 21 - page 10, line 3. See also page 17, 7-12, and FIG. 3.

In step g), claim 13 states that the tester is enabled to execute said macro in the middle of testing said plurality of programs. See present application page 28, lines 20-25, and FIG. 11A.

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001

The discussion herein of claim 13 also applies to claims 29 and 42. That is, independent claims 13, 29, and 42 have similar language, each according to the forms of the invention they claim.

Claims 3, 5-12, 14-17, 20, 22-28, 30, 33, 35-41, and 43-45 all depend on independent claims discussed above.

**Claim 29**

Claim 29 sets out computer readable program code means that includes a number of constituent means. Regarding the computer readable program code means generally, see present application, page 12, lines 5-12 (describing that processes described in the patent application may be implemented as instructions embodied in computer readable program code means for execution by a computer system).

Regarding the dividing means of the computer readable program code means in claim 29, see description herein above of process in step a) of claim 13.

Regarding the determining means in claim 29, see description herein above of process in step b) of claim 13.

Regarding the indicating means in claim 29, see description herein above of process in step c) of claim 13.

Regarding the first enabling means in claim 29, see description herein above of process in step d) of claim 13.

Regarding the means for including in claim 29, see description herein above of process in step e) of claim 13.

Regarding the second enabling means in claim 29, see description herein above of process in step f) of claim 13.

Regarding the third enabling means in claim 29, see description herein above of process in step g) of claim 13.

Regarding the storing means in claim 29, see present application, page 15, lines 4-7.

**Claim 42**

Claim 42 sets out a system enabling a tester to test a program having statements, said computer system. The claimed system includes a random access memory (120), a display unit (170), an input interface (190), a processor (110), and a storing means (secondary memory

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001

130, which may include hard drive 135 and removable storage unit 137). Present application, FIG. 1, and page 11, lines 3-4. Secondary memory 130 is suitable for storing a macro of the like. Present application, page 17, lines 8-9.

Claim 42 goes on to state various actions performed in connection with execution of a program by the processor. Regarding dividing said program into a plurality of groups, etc., as stated in claim 42, see description herein above of process in step a) of claim 13.

Regarding the processor determining ones of the groups that are executed, etc., as stated in claim 42, see description herein above of process in step b) of claim 13.

Regarding the display indicating, etc., as stated in claim 42, see description herein above of process in step c) of claim 13.

Regarding the processor enabling the tester to execute, etc., as stated in claim 42, see description herein above of process in step d) of claim 13.

Regarding the processor including an extra statement, the execution of the extra statement enabling the processor to identify an executed one of the groups, and the program being contained in a plurality of program which in turn are contained, etc., as stated in claim 42, see description herein above of process in step e) of claim 13.

Regarding the processor receiving program lines representing a macro, as stated in claim 42, see description herein above of process in step f) of claim 13.

Regarding the processor executing the macro, as stated in claim 42, see description herein above of process in step g) of claim 13.



Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001

**GROUND OF REJECTION**  
**TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

Claims 13 and 29 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty in view of Inoue, and claim 42 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty in view of Inoue and further in view of Grey. Appellant respectfully submits that the rejections are improper for reasons set out herein below.

**ARGUMENTS**

**Claims 13, 29 and 42**

**Issue One: Darty does not teach or suggest that for which it is relied upon in the rejection of claims 13, 29 and 42.**

All the limitations of the subject claims must be taught or suggested by the art relied upon. MPEP 2143.03 (citing In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974); In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970)). Darty is relied upon for teaching that groups, blocks, or any other such thing, have the property that "every statement in the program belongs to at least one of the groups" so that indicating unexecuted ones of the groups based on the ones of the groups that have been executed "enabl[es] a tester to execute said unexecuted groups such that said tester can ensure that all statements in said program are executed at least once," as claimed in the present application. Current Office Action, page 3 (citing Darty, Figure 3a, step S102 and Figure 3d, steps S150, S153, S155, S160 and S148). Appellant respectfully submits that Darty does not teach or suggest this.

In discussing fault isolation, Darty teaches fault isolation is done by correlating "test points" with "dependency sets," which includes a process of determining which dependency sets contain test point failures in progressive succession from larger to smaller dependency sets, and then comparing which sets have failures in order to converge on a "smallest fault isolation set." Darty, column 14, lines 51-67. Darty teaches that a single block of code having a fault might not be conclusively identified by test points. Darty, column 15, lines 54-61; column 18, lines 60-67. Darty states that test points are "strategically placed" so that a block of code that is the "most probable" source of a failure may be identified, "depending on the number and placement of test points." Darty, col. 9, lines 24-38; also col. 10, lines 3-10.

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001

Darty concerns detecting whether errors arose in a program that has run or is running, and if an error arises, detecting what triggered the error. For example, Darty states, "At step S153, the method of the present invention inspects the fault isolation set matrix to determine whether any entries exist therein. If the set matrix is empty, the method ends." Darty, column 12, lines 22-25. The issue of whether all statements in the program are executed at least once simply does not arise in the context of Darty's teachings.

i) Darty does not teach or suggest that "every statement in the program belongs to at least one of the groups."

Claim 13 of the present application states that the method includes "dividing said program into a plurality of groups such that *every statement in the program belongs to at least one of the groups*" (emphasis added). (Claims 29 and 42 have similar language, according to the respective forms of the invention they claim.) The Current office action contends that Darty teaches this. Current Office Action, page 3 (citing Darty, Figure 3a, step S102). Appellant respectfully disagrees.

With regard to element 102 in FIG. 3A, Darty merely teaches that "lines of the program to be tested are grouped into functional blocks." Darty, col. 9, lines 39-41. This does not teach or suggest that *all* lines of the program are grouped into blocks. Indeed, in one arrangement Darty shows a "Program ABC" in Text Layout 2, that is divided into three blocks, wherein some of the statements of the program are clearly and explicitly shown as *not* belonging to any of the three blocks. Darty, column 5, lines 30-40.

Page 12 of the Office action of December 30, 2005, specifically responded to appellant's arguments regarding the teaching of Darty relied upon for this claimed matter. (The Current Office Action does not provide such a specific response and does not withdraw or modify the previous response in this regard.) That Office action asserted that Darty, col. 21, lines 48-50, and Figure 5 teaches *all* lines of the program are grouped into blocks. Office action of December 30, 2005, page 12, second paragraph. However, Darty, col. 21, lines 48-50, merely describes "grouping lines of code of the computer program into functional blocks." Figure 5 of Darty merely shows there are blocks.

Darty's statement that "lines of the program to be tested are grouped into functional blocks" may be interpreted as meaning that in the program to be tested, *some, but not all*, lines

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001

are grouped into functional blocks. Darty's claim of "grouping lines of code of the computer program into functional blocks" may also be interpreted as meaning that in the program to be tested, *some, but not all*, lines are grouped into functional blocks. Darty's Figure 5 may be interpreted as showing the functional blocks into which *some, but not all*, lines are grouped in the program to be tested.

Indeed, Darty teaches that all blocks of code do not necessarily have associated test points. Darty, col. 10, lines 7-10. Why, then, is it presumed Darty teaches that all lines are necessarily grouped into blocks, as claimed in the present application, given that Darty never specifically states this?

ii) Darty does not teach or suggest "enabling a tester to execute said unexecuted groups such that said tester can ensure that all statements in said program are executed at least once."

The Current office action contends at page 3 that Darty, Figure 3d, steps S150, S153, S155, S160 and S148 teach "d) enabling a tester to execute said unexecuted groups such that said tester can ensure that all statements in said program are executed at least once," as recited in claim 13. Applicant respectfully disagrees. (Claims 29 and 42 have similar language, according to the respective forms of the invention they claim. The discussion herein applies also to claims 29 and 42.)

Claim 13 of the present application states that the method includes "an extra statement in each of said groups, wherein execution of such an extra statement enables said determining in step b) [, i.e., determining the ones of the groups that are executed when said program is executed while testing said program,] to identify an executed one of the groups corresponding to said extra statement." It follows that identifying the *executed* ones of the groups enables identifying the *unexecuted* groups. In other words, as stated in claim 13 of the present case, the method includes "indicating unexecuted ones of the groups based on the ones of the groups that were determined in step b) to have been executed."

It further follows that identifying the unexecuted groups enables *executing* any such unexecuted group. In other words, as stated in claim 13 of the present case, the method includes "enabling a tester to execute said unexecuted groups."

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001

Furthermore, in the present case “groups” have the property that “every statement in the program belongs to at least one of the groups.” It therefore follows, as a specific consequence of this property, that once any *unexecuted* groups are executed, *all lines in the programs will have been executed at least once*. See, first paragraph of Detailed Description of the Preferred Embodiments of the present application (“A testing program provided according to an aspect of the present invention divides each program in a class into multiple groups, with each group containing a sequence of program lines such that one can be certain that all the program lines of the group will be executed if one of the lines is executed, but for the occurrence of some abnormal condition. As a tester tests the programs in the classes, the testing program keeps track of the groups which have been executed. By ensuring at least one statement in all groups is executed, the tester can ensure that all lines in the programs are executed at least once.”) In other words, as stated in claim 13 of the present case, enabling the tester to execute said unexecuted groups produces a result “such that said tester can ensure that all statements in said program are executed at least once.”

Appellant has carefully reviewed Darty’s written specification describing Figure 3d, steps S150, S153, S155, S160 and S148, with particular scrutiny of Darty, column 11, line 55 - column 12, line 41. Appellant has also considered page 3 of the Current Office Action, which interprets “executed ones” to mean “blocks that passed.” Appellant respectfully submits that Darty simply does not teach or suggest what is claimed. The examiner’s interpretation that “executed ones” to mean “blocks that passed” does not change this.

Page 13, response 2, of the Office action of December 30, 2005, more specifically responded to appellant’s arguments regarding the teaching of Darty relied upon for this claimed matter, stating that “fault isolation set empty” in Darty’s Figure 3d, step S153, is interpreted to mean “no errors/unexecuted code.” (The Current Office Action does not provide such a specific response and does not withdraw or modify the previous response in this regard.) This interpretation merely reads teaching into Darty that is not there. The cited teaching of Darty teaching is merely that when the fault isolation set is empty at S153 this “indicat[es] a successful program execution with no code failures.” Darty, col. 12, lines 33-34.

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001

Likewise, it does not follow from Darty's teaching about "successful program execution with no code failures" that "all statements in the program [have] executed at least once," as claimed in the present application.

Likewise, page 13, response 2, of the Office action of December 30, 2005, interprets the repeating of steps depicted in Darty Figure 3d if the fault isolation set is not empty at S153 as "enabling all unexecuted code to be executed at least once." (The Current Office Action does not provide such a specific response and does not withdraw or modify the previous response in this regard.) Darty does not mention enabling all unexecuted code to be executed at least once, such that "fault isolation set empty" means "no unexecuted code."

Claims 13, 29 and 42, Issue Two: Inoue does not teach or suggest "each of said groups contains a respective sequence of ones of the statements such that all the statements of such a group are executed if at least one statement of said group is executed, and wherein such a group is deemed to be executed if at least one of the statements of the group is executed when the program is executed," as claimed.

All the limitations of the subject claims must be taught or suggested by the art relied upon. MPEP 2143.03 (citing *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974); *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970)). Claim 13, for example, states that "each of said groups contains a respective sequence of ones of the statements such that all the statements of such a group are executed if at least one statement of said group is executed, and wherein such a group is deemed to be executed if at least one of the statements of the group is executed when the program is executed." (Claims 29 and 42 have similar language.) The Current Office Action, at page 4, cites Inoue, col. 4, lines 15-25, stating that this discloses "dividing the source code into program blocks at every series of program groups and generating basic block data at every program block" and that it discloses "generated blocks are outputted by executing the procedure." Appellant respectfully submits that dividing source code into program blocks at every series of program groups, generating basic block data at every program block, and outputting generated blocks by executing the procedure does not teach or suggest "each of said groups [i.e., groups "such that every statement in the program belongs to at least one of the groups"] contains a respective

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001

sequence of ones of the statements such that all the statements of such a group are executed if at least one statement of said group is executed, and wherein such a group is deemed to be executed if at least one of the statements of the group is executed when the program is executed," as claimed.

Claims 13, 29 and 42

Issue Three: The new ground of rejection introduced by the Inoue reference should be withdrawn because it has not been shown to fully meet at least one claim, nor meet it except for differences shown to be completely obvious.

In the Office action of March 10, 2004 (i.e., the action immediately preceding appellant's first Appeal Brief, which was dated August 18, 2004), claims 1-6, 9-15, 17-23, 25-36 and 38-44 were rejected on the basis of the combination of Darty and Rodrigues. Upon reopening prosecution after considering Applicant's first Appeal Brief, a November 29, 2004, Office action indicated that claims 13, 29 and 42 were allowable if amended to include their base claims.<sup>1</sup> This clearly indicates that claims 13, 29 and 42 are allowable over the combination of Rodrigues and Darty. However, although claims 13, 29 and 42 were cooperatively and responsively amended solely to incorporate all limitations of their base claims, these claims were then rejected on new grounds.

When an examiner has become convinced a previously rejected claim is allowable over prior grounds of rejection, the claim should be allowed, except for certain limited situations in which the claim may be subjected to a new ground of rejection. MPEP 706.7(e) ("The examiner may withdraw the rejection of finally rejected claims. If new facts or reasons are presented such as to convince the examiner that the previously rejected claims are in fact allowable . . . , then the final rejection should be withdrawn. "Although it is permissible to withdraw a final rejection for the purpose of entering a new ground of rejection, this practice is to be limited . . . "). The exception applies, that is, a new grounds of rejection is proper instead of allowance, when a certain test is met. MPEP 706.7(e) (" . . . this practice is to be limited to situations where a new reference either fully meets at least one claim or meets it except for differences which are shown to be completely obvious.").

---

<sup>1</sup> For a complete history of prosecution, see Appendix DD.

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001


Appellant's first Appeal Brief, convinced the examiner and his supervisor<sup>2</sup> that claims 13, 29 and 42 were allowable. However, after Appellant amended those claims solely to incorporate all limitations of their base claims, prosecution was reopened based on a new ground of rejection that depended upon ATAC, and then, once again, reopened after appellant's second Appeal Brief to substitute Inoue for ATAC, despite a complete lack of amendments necessitating the new grounds of rejection.

Applicant submits that the present rejection based on Inoue is improper (like the rejection before it that depended on ATAC), since the test of MPEP 706.7(e) is not met. That is, Appellant submits that the newly cited reference, Inoue, does not fully meet at least one claim, nor does it meet at least one claim except for differences shown to be completely obvious. Indeed, the Current Office Action does not present arguments to make this showing nor even *contend* that Inoue meets this test. Moreover, Inoue was available as a reference long before it was cited and long before the subject claims were presented for examination. For these reasons, the ground of rejection based on Inoue is improper and should be withdrawn. Instead, the claims should be promptly allowed.

### **REQUEST FOR ACTION**

Based on the above arguments, appellant requests that the pending claims of the present application be allowed and that the application promptly be passed to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Anthony V.S. England  
Registration No. 35,129  
Attorney of Record for  
IBM Corporation  
Telephone: 512-477-7165  
a@aengland.com

Attachments: Appendices AA, BB, CC and DD

---

<sup>2</sup> MPEP 1002.02(d) Petitions and Matters Decided by Supervisory Patent Examiners.

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001**APPENDIX "AA"****CLAIMS**

1. (canceled)

2. (canceled)

3. (previously presented) The method of claim 13, wherein said extra statements contain respective group identifiers, wherein said determining in step b) further comprises examining such a group identifier to determine a specific one of the groups which has been executed.

4. (canceled)

5. (previously presented) The method of claim 13, further comprising the steps of:  
grouping a sequence of the groups into a block; and  
determining that said block has been executed only if all of the groups of the block are executed.

6. (original) The method of claim 5, wherein said grouping comprises:  
determining a language structure present in said plurality of programs;  
grouping a subset of groups present in said language structure into a block such that the statements in said language structure are presented as a block to said tester.

7. (original) The method of claim 6, wherein said blocks are defined hierarchically according to the inclusive relationship of language structures in said plurality of programs.

8. (original) The method of claim 7, wherein said language structure comprises one of program delimiters, control structure and loop structure.



Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001**APPENDIX "AA"****CLAIMS**

9. (previously presented) The method of claim 13, wherein said enabling comprises:  
enabling said tester to examine the statements associated with said unexecuted blocks such that said tester can determine arguments which would cause an unexecuted block to be executed;

enabling said tester to enter said determined arguments to cause said unexecuted block to be executed.

10. (previously presented) The method of claim 9, wherein such an argument comprises an instance of another object.

11. (original) The method of claim 10, further comprises:  
enabling said tester to instantiate said instance of said another object;  
enabling said tester to assign a name to said instance, wherein said tester can enter said name to provide said instance as an argument value.

12. (original) The method of claim 11, further comprising:  
receiving a string as an argument; and  
determining that said string indicates that said instance is said argument value if said name matches said string.

13. (previously presented) A method of testing a program having statements, said method comprising the steps of:

a) dividing said program into a plurality of groups such that every statement in the program belongs to at least one of the groups, wherein each of said groups contains a respective sequence of ones of the statements such that all the statements of such a group are executed if at least one statement of said group is executed, and wherein such a group is

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001**APPENDIX "AA"****CLAIMS**

deemed to be executed if at least one of the statements of the group is executed when the program is executed;

b) determining the ones of the groups that are executed when said program is executed while testing said program;

c) indicating unexecuted ones of the groups based on the ones of the groups that were determined in step b) to have been executed;

d) enabling a tester to execute said unexecuted groups such that said tester can ensure that all statements in said program are executed at least once;

e) including an extra statement in each of said groups, wherein execution of such an extra statement enables said determining in step b) to identify an executed one of the groups corresponding to said extra statement, wherein said program is contained in a plurality of programs which in turn are contained in a class of an object oriented environment;

f) enabling said tester to define a macro containing a plurality of program lines; storing said macro in a database; and

g) enabling said tester to execute said macro in the middle of testing said plurality of programs.

14. (original) The method of claim 13, wherein said macro is designed to examine the data structures within an instance of an object or to set the values for the variables in the object.

15. (previously presented) The method of claim 13, wherein said dividing, determining, indicating and enabling are performed in a single computer system.

16. (previously amended) The method of claim 13, wherein said object is generated in Java Programming language.

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001**APPENDIX "AA"****CLAIMS**

17. (previously presented) The method of claim 13, further comprising:  
enabling said tester to load said class;  
enabling said tester to instantiate an instance of said class; and  
enabling said tester to execute said program on said instance.

18. (canceled)

19. (canceled)

20. (previously presented) The computer program product of claim 29, wherein said extra statements contain respective group identifiers, wherein said determining means examines such a group identifier to determine a specific one of the groups which has been executed.

21. (canceled)

22. (previously presented) The computer program product of claim 29, further comprising grouping means for grouping a sequence of the groups into a block, and second determining means for determining that said block has been executed only if all of the groups of the block are executed.

23. (previously presented) The computer program product of claim 22, wherein said grouping means comprises:

third determining means for determining a language structure present in said plurality of programs;

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001**APPENDIX "AA"****CLAIMS**

a second grouping means for grouping a subset of groups present in said language structure into a block such that the statements in said language structure are presented as a block to said tester.

24. (original) The computer program product of claim 23, wherein said blocks are defined hierarchically according to the inclusive relationship of language structures in said plurality of programs.

25. (previously presented) The computer program product of claim 29, wherein said enabling means comprises:

second enabling means for enabling said tester to examine the statements associated with said unexecuted blocks such that said tester can determine arguments which would cause an unexecuted block to be executed;

third enabling means for enabling said tester to enter said determined arguments to cause said unexecuted block to be executed.

26. (previously presented) The computer program product of claim 25, wherein such an argument comprises an instance of another object, and the computer program product further comprises:

means for enabling said tester to instantiate said instance of said another object;

means for enabling said tester to assign a name to said instance, wherein said tester can enter said name to provide said instance as an argument value.

27. (original) The computer program product of claim 26, further comprising:

means for receiving a string as an argument; and

means for determining that said string indicates that said instance is said argument if said name matches said string.

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001**APPENDIX "AA"****CLAIMS**

28. (previously presented) The computer program product of claim 29, wherein said macro is designed to examine the data structures within an instance of an object or to set the values for the variables in the object.

29. (previously presented) A computer program product for use with a computer system, said computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied in said computer usable medium, said computer readable program code means enabling testing of a program having statements, said computer readable program code means comprising:

dividing means for dividing said program into a plurality of groups such that every statement in the program belongs to at least one of the groups, wherein each of said groups contains a respective sequence of ones of the statements such that all the statements of such a group are executed if at least one statement of said group is executed, and wherein such a group is deemed to be executed if at least one of the statements of the group is executed when the program is executed;

determining means for determining the ones of the groups that are executed when said program is executed while testing said program;

indicating means for indicating unexecuted ones of the groups based on said determining;

first enabling means for enabling a tester to execute said unexecuted groups such that said tester can ensure that all statements in said program are executed at least once;

means for including an extra statement in each of said groups, wherein execution of such an extra statement enables said determining means to identify an executed one of the groups corresponding to said extra statement, wherein said program is contained in a plurality of programs which in turn are contained in a class of an object oriented environment;

second enabling means for enabling said tester to define a macro containing a plurality of program lines;

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001**APPENDIX "AA"****CLAIMS**

storing means for storing said macro; and  
third enabling means for enabling said tester to execute said macro in the middle of testing said plurality of programs.

30. (original) The computer program product of claim 26, further comprising:  
means for enabling said tester to load said class;  
means for enabling said tester to instantiate an instance of said class; and  
means for enabling said tester to execute said program on said instance.

31. (canceled)

32. (canceled)

33. (previously presented) The system of claim 42, wherein said extra statements contain respective group identifiers, wherein said processor examines such a group identifier to determine a specific one of the groups which has been executed.

34. (canceled)

35. (previously presented) The system of claim 42, wherein said processor groups a sequence of the groups into a block, and wherein said display indicates that said block has been executed only if all of the groups of the block are executed.

36. (original) The system of claim 35, wherein said processor groups said sequence of groups according to a language structure present in said plurality of programs.

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001**APPENDIX "AA"****CLAIMS**

37. (original) The system of claim 36, wherein said blocks are defined hierarchically according to the inclusive relationship of language structures in said plurality of programs.

38. (previously presented) The system of claim 42, wherein said processor receives instructions from said input interface to display the statements associated with said unexecuted blocks, said processor causing the statements to be displayed on said display unit such that said tester can determine arguments which would cause an unexecuted block to be execute.

39. (previously presented) The system of claim 38, wherein such an argument comprises an instance of another object.

40. (original) The system of claim 39, wherein said processor instantiates said instance of another object in response to receiving an instruction to instantiate said instance of said another object, said processor further associating a name associated with said instance of another object, wherein said name is received from said input interface and said tester can enter said name to provide said instance as an argument value.

41. (original) The system of claim 40, wherein said processor receives a string as an argument and determines that said string indicates that said instance is said argument value if said name matches said string.

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001**APPENDIX "AA"****CLAIMS**

42. (previously presented) A system enabling a tester to test a program having statements, said computer system comprising:

a random access memory (RAM);

a display unit containing a display screen;

an input interface;

a processor dividing said program into a plurality of groups such that every statement in the program belongs to at least one of the groups, wherein each of said groups contains a respective sequence of ones of the statements such that all the statements of such a group are executed if at least one statement of said group is executed, and wherein such a group is deemed to be executed if at least one of the statements of the group is executed when the program is executed,

said processor executing said program in response to instructions received from said input interface;

said processor determining the ones of the groups that are executed when said program is executed;

said processor causing a display to be generated on said display unit, said display indicating unexecuted ones of the groups based on the ones of the groups that were determined to have been executed;

said processor enabling said tester to execute said unexecuted groups such that said tester can ensure that all statements in said program are executed at least once, wherein said processor includes an extra statement in each of said groups, wherein execution of such an extra statement enables said processor to identify an executed one of the groups corresponding to said extra; and

wherein said computer system further comprises a secondary storage, wherein said processor stores said program including said extra statement on said secondary storage, wherein said program is contained in a plurality of programs which in turn are contained in a class of an object oriented environment, wherein said processor receives a plurality of



Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001

## **APPENDIX "AA"**

### **CLAIMS**

program lines representing a macro, said processor storing said macro in a database, and said processor executing said macro in response to receiving an instruction to execute said macro.

43. (original) The system of claim 42, wherein said macro is designed to examine the data structures within an instance of an object or to set the values for the variables in the object.

44. (previously presented) The system of claim 42, wherein said processor loads said class into said RAM in response to receiving an instruction to load said class, said processor further instantiating an instance of said class in response to receiving another instruction, said processor executing said program on said instance in response to receiving one more instruction.

45. (previously presented) The system of claim 42, wherein said input interface is connected to at least one of a mouse and a key-board.

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001

**APPENDIX "BB"**  
**EVIDENCE**

NONE.

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001

**APPENDIX "CC"  
RELATED PROCEEDINGS**

NONE.

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001**APPENDIX "DD" HISTORY OF THE CASE**

In a first Office action dated September 25, 2003, all the claims were rejected. Specifically, claims 1-6, 9-15, 17-23, 25-36 and 38-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) based on U.S. patent 6,067, 639 (Rodrigues). Claims 7, 8, 24, 37 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Rodrigues in view of U.S. patent 5,860,009 (Uchihira). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) based on Rodrigues et al. in view of U.S. patent 6,397,378 B1 (Grey).

In Amendment A, dated December 26, 2003, method claims 1, 2, 3 and 5, computer program product claims 18, 19, 20 and 22, and system claims 31, 32, 33 and 35 were responsively amended in an effort to overcome the rejections. Claims 23 and 36 were also amended to conform them to their amended base claims. Claims 9, 25 and 38 were amended to correct informalities.

In a second Office action of March 10, 2004, claims 1-45 were finally rejected. Specifically, claims 1-6, 9-16, 17-23, 25-36 and 38-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Rodrigues in view of U.S. patent 6,067,639 (Darty). Claims 7, 8, 24, 37 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Rodrigues in view of Darty, and further in view of Uchihira. Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal of June 9, 2004, then an Appeal Brief of August 14, 2004.

In a third Office action of December 7, 2004, the examiner reopened prosecution, withdrawing the Rodrigues reference and asserting a new reference, Telcordia Software Visualization and Analysis Toolsuite User's Manual, Chapter 3, ATAC: Overview (ATAC). The third Office action stated claims 13, 29, & 42 were allowable if written in independent form incorporating all the elements and limitations of their respective base claims. Inexplicably, the third Office action was final.

Appellant filed a Request for Reconsideration on January 4, 2005, within the first month of the reply period, to contend the final rejection was improper and request a new, non-final Office action. However, upon further consideration appellant filed a Supplemental Reply on March 28, 2005, which was during the fourth month of the reply period, withdrawing the Request for Reconsideration, canceling the unallowed claims and amending claims to put them

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001**APPENDIX "DD" HISTORY OF THE CASE**

in condition for allowance, exactly as indicated in the third Office action. The Supplemental Reply of March 28, 2005, was before any reply from the Office to Appellant's the Request for Reconsideration.

In reply, an Advisory Action of April 6, 2005, reversed the Office's previous position and did not allow the amended claims. The rejection of the Advisory Action relied only on the art that had already been cited in the indicated allowability of the third Office action.

In reply to the Advisory Action, appellant requested in a written Request for Action of June 2, 2005, and in numerous telephone conversations prior to that written request, that a new, non-final Office action be issued, and that the period for reply be restarted in the new Office action.

A fourth Office action of June 8, 2005, which was non-final, essentially repeated the rejections of the third Office action, but also reapplied Grey in combination with certain ones of the other references for rejection of some of the claims.

Appellant filed a Reply to Office action on October 7, 2005, presenting arguments to traverse, but did not amend the claims.

In a fifth Office action of December 30, 2005, claims 3, 5, 6, 9, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, 23, 25 and 29 were finally rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty, in view of ATAC. Claims 10-12, 14, 17, 26-28 and 30 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty, in view of ATAC, and further in view of Rodrigues. Claims 7, 8 and 24 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty, in view of ATAC, and further in view of Uchihira. Claims 33, 35-38, 40-43 and 45 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty, in view of ATAC, and further in view of Grey. Claims 39 and 44 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty, in view of ATAC, Grey, and Rodrigues. Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal of April 4, 2006, and then an Appeal Brief of June 5, 2006.

A sixth Office action of October 6, 2006, which was non-final, reopened prosecution. In the sixth Office action the ATAC reference was withdrawn and a new reference, U.S. patent 5,729,676 (Inoue) was asserted in its place. Thus, Claims 3, 5, 6, 9, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, 23, 25

Docket JP920000411US1

Appl. No.: 09/783,250  
Filed: February 14, 2001**APPENDIX "DD" HISTORY OF THE CASE**

and 29 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty, in view of Inoue. Claims 10-12, 14, 17, 26-28 and 30 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty, in view of Inoue, and further in view of Rodrigues. Claims 7, 8 and 24 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty, in view of Inoue, and further in view of Uchihiro. Claims 33, 35-45, and 45 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty, in view of Inoue, and further in view of Grey. Claim 44 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darty, in view of Inoue, and further in view of Grey, and further in view of Rodrigues.